The Purpose of this Workshop

- For: Procedures Oversight Designees (PODS), CEF/P&T Chairs, and TIU heads supporting P&T reviews

- What: Overview of roles and responsibilities

- Why: To help familiarize unit-level leadership with their roles and responsibilities in the P&T process.

  ➤ Chat function is available for questions

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Common Initials and Terms

- **P&T**   Promotion and Tenure
- **TIU**   Tenure Initiating Unit (department or school)
- **TIU Head**   Chair or Director
- **Chair Pro Tem**   Temp. TIU Head
- **CEF**   Committee of Eligible Faculty
- **College Panels**   College divisional committees of senior faculty
- **P&T Chair**   Chair of CEF
- **POD**   Procedures Oversight Designee
- **APT**   Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Doc.
- **POA**   Pattern of Administration Doc.
- **SEI**   Student Evaluations of Instruction
- **OAA**   Office of Academic Affairs

Agenda

- POD Responsibilities
- POD Forms
- CEF Chair Responsibilities
- CEF Review Meeting Structure
- CEF Voting
- CEF Letter
- TIU Head Responsibilities
- Resources

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

POD

Kristi Williams

Procedures Oversight Designee (POD)

- Provides oversight of each member of the eligible faculty's responsibility for the integrity of the P&T review process, ensuring that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, and free of bias.

- Must be a member of the eligible faculty for all cases overseen

- May not be the department chair, CEF Chair, or P&T Chair (in units that have P&T subcommittees)

- Units may have multiple PODs in any review cycle

POD Responsibilities – Before the Review

➢ Reviews candidate's case and all submitted materials to ensure they are prepared using current required format.

➢ Asks candidate to make any required changes and verifies that changes have been made

➢ Verifies the accuracy of all scholarship and citations in the core dossier (but candidate is fully responsible for accuracy)

➢ Completes POD Form 1 Dossier Checklist before providing the dossier to the eligible faculty

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

POD Responsibilities – Case Review
Most common Issues to check for in Candidate's Case

➢ **Core Dossier**

- o If the candidate includes scholarship and/or awards dated before their start date or date of last promotion/reappointment, subheadings or other indicators must clearly distinguishing those earlier activities.

- o The student evaluation and peer evaluation columns in Item 4 (Courses Taught table) should accurately reflect SEI reports and peer evaluations submitted with the case. Only classes taught since date of hire (for probationary faculty) or date of last promotion/reappointment or last 5 years (for nonprobationary faculty) should be included in this item.

- o In Items 14 (Scholarly Contributions and Creative Productions), 15 (Research Funding), and 16 (Contracts and Non-Research Grant Funding), all publications and grants with multiple authors/investigators must include a narrative description and percentage of the candidate's intellectual contribution.

POD Responsibilities – Case Review

Most common Issues to check for in Candidate's Case

➤ **APT** - Do not include a copy of the currently approved APT. Only if candidate chooses to use criteria from an older version should this be uploaded to their case.

➤ **SEI Reports** - Confirm all SEI Overview Reports have been included for all classes reported in Item 4 (Courses Taught table) and that earlier reports before the review period are excluded

➤ **SEI Student Comment Summaries (if used)** - Summaries should be included for all classes reported in Item 4 and the name and role of the person who created the summaries is included along with the total number of student in each class and the number of respondents

➤ **External Evaluation Letters** - If an evaluation letter is unsigned, always include the email to which it was attached to verify sender

POD Responsibilities – Review Meeting

➢ Verifies that the number of eligible faculty needed to constitute a quorum are present and notes the number of votes needed to recommend a positive decision as defined in the unit APT

➢ At meeting onset, outlines procedures to be followed and asks eligible faculty to identify any conflicts of interest

➢ Informs eligible faculty of four core meeting requirements (see next slide)

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Review Meeting Requirements

➢ All discussions in the meeting are confidential and should not be shared with others, including the candidate.

➢ Each candidate is to be evaluated using only information provided in the dossier. New information about the candidate not been documented in the dossier should not be introduced or considered.

➢ Discussion of each case focuses on determining whether the candidate has met each of the unit's criteria in scholarship, teaching, and service in the unit APT and documenting evidence that supports these conclusions

➢ Each candidate is evaluated individually only in comparison to the APT criteria. No direct comparisons between candidates should be made.

POD Responsibilities – After the Review

➤ Complete Required POD forms (more on this later)

   ➤ POD Form 2 Deliberative Body Verification

   ➤ Quorum, Vote, and Vote Percentage Form: May delegate completion of this form to case manager but POD must provide the required information and ensure its accuracy.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

POD Responsibilities – Throughout

➢ Make reasonable effort to ensure that the eligible faculty follow the written procedures governing reviews and that proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner.

➢ Written procedures are taken from Chapter 3 of the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook and from the unit's current approved TIU APT document. If candidates to be evaluated under an older APT, only the older criteria are used. All procedures come from the current APT document.

➢ Monitor review process to ensure candidates are treated fairly

POD Concerns & TIU Head Responsibilities

➢ POD should first address any concerns about possible procedural errors directly with the relevant party.

➢ If the issue is not resolved, it should be escalated to the TIU head who must respond in writing with either corrective action or a rationale for inaction.

➢ The issue raised by the POD and the response or resolution must be documented and included in the dossier.

➢ The POD or TIU Head should consult the ASC Office of Faculty Affairs to ensure proper procedures are followed.

POD Forms

Toni Calbert

Sample POD Forms available on ASC Intranet

CEF/P&T Chair

Name of Presenter

CEF Chair (or P&T Chair)

➢ In units that have a P&T subcommittee of the CEF, the P&T chair may take on the responsibilities of the CEF chair

➢ Ensures that all responsibilities of the CEF are carried out

➢ Ensures a descriptive summary of the candidate's performance is provided to the CEF with the dossier

➢ Presides at the review meeting of the eligible faculty

➢ Writes separate letter to the TIU head after the review meeting (more details later) summarizing the CEF evaluation of each candidate and vote

CEF Review Meeting Structure

ASC strongly recommends the following structure for the CEF review meeting, following the POD's introduction and overview of procedures.

➢ For first candidate, read or show the first criterion in teaching and lead CEF in discussion on evidence in the dossier (or lack of evidence) that the candidate has met it. Repeat for each criterion in teaching and hold broader discussion of whether the candidate has met teaching standards

➢ Repeat process for scholarship and then for service.

➢ Open floor to further discussion on the first candidate and whether they have met all criteria for promotion before conducting the vote

➢ Repeat process for each additional candidate under consideration.

CEF Review Meeting—Voting

➢ Must occur before the meeting concludes

➢ OAA strongly recommends that all voting use Qualtrics surveys. See the OAA Promotion and Tenure website for instructions on creating Qualtrics voting surveys for P&T

➢ In fully online or hybrid review meetings (in which at least one eligible faculty member participates remotely): All CEF members MUST vote only via Qualtrics survey to ensure all ballots are anonymous.

➢ In fully in-person meetings (with no remote participants): Anonymous paper ballots or Qualtrics survey may be used

CEF Letter – After Review Meeting

➤ Drafted by the CEF or P&T chair and circulated to the CEF for comments before the final version is sent to the TIU head.

➤ Should not be simply a descriptive summary of the candidate's performance

➤ Should summarize CEF's discussion on whether candidate has met each criterion and whether they have met standards in each evaluation category (scholarship, teaching, service) and overall

➤ Highlight any areas of disagreement or note strong consensus

CEF Letter – Introduction (Sample)

On <Date>, the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) of the <Enter TIU> at Ohio State University met to consider <candidate> for <promotion or reappointment> to the rank of <indicate faculty title and rank>. This letter reports on that discussion and the final vote. Present in the meeting were <list eligible faculty present>*.

*We recommend also listing eligible faculty who were not present and the reason for their absence (formally approved leave, conflict of interest, or absent unexcused)

CEF Letter – Structure (Sample)

➢ Use subheadings for area of evaluation (e.g., Teaching, Scholarship, Service). For each area, do the following:

➢ State each criterion as listed in the APT, summarize the CEF discussion on whether candidate has met each criterion, and provide multiple examples of relevant evidence (or lack of evidence) in the dossier to support these perspectives.

➢ State the conclusion of the CEF on whether the candidate has met the full criteria in that area of evaluation and note whether there was consensus or describe any dissenting perspectives and their focus.

CEF Letter – Conclusion (Sample)

➤ Conclude with a subheading labeled "Summary" or similar and describe the final recommendation of the committee and the vote.

➤ Example: "Having demonstrated that Dr. X meets or exceeds our criteria in research, teaching, and service, the CEF recommends Dr. X for promotion to <rank>. The final vote was X in favor of promotion to <rank> and 0 opposed.*

Or, the vote can instead be noted in the introduction to the letter

TIU Head

Kristi Williams

TIU Head Role

➤ Attends the eligible faculty meeting as observer and to answer procedural questions but does not vote.

➤ After receiving the CEF letter, independently assesses the candidate and provides their own recommendation on promotion/reappointment

➤ If recommendation differs from the CEF, explains why in the letter and also informs the eligible faculty

➤ Informs candidate in writing that the TIU review process is complete, provides CEF and TIU head letters, and begins 10-day comment period.

Procedural Errors and Significant New Information

Kristi Williams

Procedural Errors

➢ Significant procedural errors that could reasonably have affected the outcome of deliberations are to be corrected at the level of review at which it occurred and the case fully reconsidered from that point.

➢ Depending on when the error occurred, this may require holding a new eligible faculty meeting, discussion, and vote.

➢ See Chapter 3, Section 4 of the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook and contact divisional dean and/or ASC Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs for guidance.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Significant New Information

➤ Chapter 3, Section 4.2 of OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook

➤ Reviews proceed on the basis of the candidate's record at the beginning of the review process.

➤ The candidate's record may be amended when significant new information about items already in the dossier becomes available (e.g., acceptance of a publication that was listed as under review; funding of grants listed as submitted)

➤ An amended record must be reviewed by all parties to the process.

➤ Contact ASC Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs for guidance on process.

Resources

- [ASC Intranet – Promotion and Tenure](#)

- [Chapter 3 of the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook](#))

- [OAA Office of Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure website](#)

- [Unit APT document](#)

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

ASC Faculty Affairs Team

General Faculty Affairs Email Account:
ascfacultyaffairs@osu.edu

Kristi Williams
Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs
Professor of Sociology
williams.2339@osu.edu

Toni Calbert
Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs
calbert.5@osu.edu

Kyle Williams
Senior Faculty Affairs Specialist
williams.5301@osu.edu

Elizabeth Murphy
Faculty Affairs Specialist
murphy.926@osu.edu

Destanie Scales
Executive Assistant
scales.106@osu.edu

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Thank you!